

REMARKS

Claims 1-15

Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2-15 ultimately depend. Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen (6,275,214). Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice. Applicant notes that claim 33 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, but which depends from a rejected base claim, claim 31. Applicant has amended claim 1 to at least substantially include the claim language of claim 33. On this basis, Applicant submits that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable.

Claims 16-28

Claim 16 is an independent claim, from which claims 17-28 ultimately depend. Claims 16-28 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen. Claim 18 has been cancelled without prejudice. As noted above, claim 33 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, but which depends from a rejected base claim, claim 31. Applicant has amended claim 16 to at least substantially include the claim language of claim 33, and on this basis submits that claim 16 and its dependent claims are patentable.

Claim 29

Claim 29 is an independent claim that has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen. Applicant has amended claim 29 to at least substantially include the claim language of claim 33 as well, and on this basis submits that claim 29 is patentable.

Claim 30

Claim 30 is an independent claim that has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen. Applicant has amended claim 30 to at least substantially include the claim language of claim 33 as well, and on this basis submits that claim 30 is patentable.

Claims 31-34

Claim 31 is an independent claim, from which claims 32-34 ultimately depend. Claims 31 and 32 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen. Claims 33 and 34 have been objected to as including allowable subject matter, but which depend from a rejected base claim, claim 31. Applicant has amended claim 31 to recite the limitations of claim 33, and has cancelled claim 33. Claim 34 has been amended to depend from claim 31 instead of from claim 33. Applicant therefore submits that claims 31, 32, and 34 are patentable.

Claims 35-37

Claim 35 is an independent claim, from which claims 36 and 37 ultimately depend. Claims 35-37 have been allowed.

Claims 38-42

Claim 38 is an independent claim, from which claims 39-42 ultimately depend. Claims 38-42 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen. As noted above, claim 33 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, but which depends from a rejected base claim, claim 31. Applicant has amended claim 38 to at least substantially include the claim language of claim 33, and on this basis submits that claim 38 and its dependent claims are patentable.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicants' Attorney, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

April 15, 2008
Date

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
1474 N Cooper Rd #105-248
Gilbert, AZ 85233
tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 425-563-2098